Case 1:10-cr-00162-KMW Document 209 Filed 02/19/15 Page 1 of 37

F1KJELHS Sentence UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 10 Cr. 162 KMW V. 5 WESAM EL-HANAFI, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 9 January 20, 2015 New York, New York 10 11 12 Before: 13 HON. KIMBA M. WOOD, 14 District Judge 15 16 **APPEARANCES** 17 18 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the 19 Southern District of New York JOHN P. CRONAN, 20 MICHAEL D. LOCKARD, Assistant United States Attorneys 21 22 LAW OFFICE OF SARAH KUNSTLER, Attorneys for defendant El-Hanafi 23 BY: SARAH KUNSTLER, Esq. REBECCA HEINEGG, Esq. 24 Of counsel 25

1 (In open court) (Case called) 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning. Please have a seat. Good 4 morning, Mr. El-Hanafi. We are here for the sentencing of Mr. 5 El-Hanafi. I'd like to begin by asking Ms. Kuntsler, have you 6 and Mr. El-Hanafi had an adequate opportunity to review the 7 presentence report? 8 MS. KUNSTLER: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Are the corrections you wished to have 10 made to it the same as in your June 17th, 2013 letter to me? 11 MS. KUNSTLER: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: In Paragraph 12, you object to the amounts 13 sent per week by Mr. El-Hanafi and Mr. Hasanoff to Al-Qaeda. 14 It seems to me it might be more appropriate to simply state the 15 total that the two of them sent. MS. KUNSTLER: That is acceptable to us, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Is the total 70,000 or less than that? MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, I believe the total 18 forfeiture was 70,000 because the total was 67,000 and then 19 20 approximately \$3,000 in other equipment such as computer 21 equipment. 22 THE COURT: All right. So Paragraph 12 will now read: 23 "Starting in around 2007, El-Hanafi and Hasanoff sent

a total of approximately \$67,000 to a senior Al-Qaeda operative

24

25

in Yemen."

MR. CRONAN: No objection to that from the government, your Honor.

MS. KUNSTLER: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With respect to Paragraph 27, you have a number of objections. I propose the following:

"Wesam El-Hanafi also received various assignments from CC-4 which he was instructed to relay to Hesanoff and CC-1. El-Hanafi was directed to research specific types of military jackets, military boots, military pants, video camcorders and remote control cars."

I would add this: "The video cameras were to be used by Al-Qaeda to record tactical operations against U.S. and coalition forces to then use on the internet as propaganda."

With respect to the remote cars, "El-Hanafi was directed to research cars with specific frequencies of radio signals. Al-Qaeda desired these remote control cars because they could be modified into components for explosives. After researching these items, El-Hanafi directed Hasanoff to purchase and ship such a remote control device to Al-Qaeda in Yemen, which Hasanoff did."

MS. KUNSTLER: One moment. Ms. Heinegg is handling the objections. She has a question for Mr. El-Hanafi.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Discussion off the record)

MS. HEINEGG: Your Honor, as to Paragraph 27, rather

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

than	adopt	tha	at mod:	ific	cati	ion,	we	would	prefer	to	withdraw	that
objec	tion	and	leave	it	as	it	is.					

THE COURT: What is the government's view?

MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, we don't think either formulation is accurate based on the facts.

THE COURT: All right. I will leave Paragraph 27 as it was originally written.

With respect to Paragraph 22, I propose to take out the last two sentences.

MS. KUNSTLER: Paragraph 22, your Honor?

THE COURT: 32.

(Discussion off the record)

MS. HEINEGG: That is acceptable to us, your Honor.

MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, so I understand, the entire paragraph?

THE COURT: No. The first sentence remains, which would state:

"In addition to recruiting CC-1 for Al-Qaeda, Wesam El-Hanafi performed tasks for Al-Qaeda in New York City in May 2008."

MR. CRONAN: That is acceptable, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: According to the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. El-Hanafi's doctor's recommendations for future treatment and placement will receive the most credence if a paragraph is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

placed in the PSR. So I would urge defense counsel to draft and run by the government something consistent with the most recent treating doctor, most recent expert's recommendations.

MS. KUNSTLER: Your Honor, we'll do so. We submitted a letter, dated January 16th, from Dr. Weitz, and that will be the basis on which --

THE COURT: Right. I considered attaching that, but I think it carries more force if it is a paragraph in the PSR. It could be a long paragraph.

> MS. KUNSTLER: Okav.

THE COURT: I have read all the sentencing submissions including a letter --

MR. CRONAN: I apologize, your Honor. Before we're done with the PSR, there is one change the government was going to request. It was not in the draft, the original draft, so we apologize for not raising it earlier. It is a bit unusual, but in the recommendation section at the very end, and specifically Page 23, it may just be a matter of rephrasing the third paragraph, but in light of the pending civil litigation regarding the medical care, I think it is important to note that to the extent the PSR reports the cause of Mr. El-Hanafi's medical condition, it either not represent what caused it or make clear it is according to Mr. El-Hanafi, and the Bureau of Prisons disputes it.

Earlier in the PSR it makes clear Mr. El-Hanafi claims

the DVT was caused by his transport. Here it was phrased more categorically it was, in fact, caused by the transport.

THE COURT: What are your specific proposals?

Looking at the third full paragraph, do you want to stop at the word, "foot"?

MS. HEINEGG: Your Honor, we would be fine with amending it to read or begin, "According to Mr. El-Hanafi."

MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, I think that's right. If we start each of the sentences with "According to Mr. El-Hanafi," it would address any concerns that we have.

THE COURT: Okay. That is only in the third full paragraph on Page 23?

MR. CRONAN: That's right. It would start with, "according to Mr. El-Hanafi, Mr. El-Hanafi has suffered permanent damage," and the sentence would continue.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CRONAN: Just to be perfectly clear, I would suggest that each of the sentences in that paragraph also starting --

THE COURT: Also, "according to Mr. El-Hanafi," I'll make those changes. All right.

I have read all of the sentencing submissions including a letter from Mr. El-Hanafi and the many letters from Mr. El-Hanafi's family, attesting to his proactive kindness toward all of them, and I learned during the course of the

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

one-day hearing the extent to which Mr. El-Hanafi suffers from a debilitating illness.

I would be glad to hear first from Ms. Kunstler, then defendant and then the government.

MS. KUNSTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Would you mind if I stood at the podium?

THE COURT: Not at all.

MS. KUNSTLER: Thank you.

Your Honor, all of us, the Court, the government and defense counsel, have spent a long time on Mr. El-Hanafi's medical condition.

I want to start out by thanking the court for giving us this time, time for me to return from maternity leave and assume responsibility for the case, time for Ms. Heinegg and I to find Dr. Weitz, to review the materials in this case, time for Dr. Weitz to review them and time for that very long hearing that we had last week or week before. It is blurring together for me now.

As a result of this, we all better understand Mr. El-Hanafi's, medical care Mr. El-Hanafi has received, his medical needs going forward and the extent of his disability. Last week's hearing was informative. I don't want to dwell on it partly because I'm still exhausted from it myself. I think it is clear, as it was clear from the reports that the doctor submitted, that our experts have very different perspectives.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Their perspectives differ on how Mr. El-Hanafi's DVT began, the quality of medical care he has received within the Bureau of Prisons, and how that care impacted his ongoing disease and disability. What I would like to highlight from that hearing is this:

Our experts come to their conclusions from vastly different sets of experiences. Dr. Weitz, as the court knows, has authored over 200 peer-reviewed articles on DVT. He has participated in numerous clinical trials. He has been treating patients with DVT for more than 30 years. His opinions are based on his experiences as a practitioner and researcher, but they're also based on the peer-reviewed research of others in the field which is used to support his conclusions.

In contrast, Dr. McKinsey has not participated in clinical studies on DVT, has not published peer-reviewed articles on thrombosis, and his conclusions on the natural or what he refers to as the natural progression of DVT is not something that is documented in the medical literature, but rather, according to his testimony, something that was based on his experience and the experience of others who practice with, more of a general knowledge.

This experience, the experience in which he bases his conclusions is far more limited than Dr. Weitz. Dr. McKinsey estimated I think he has treated 500 to 600 patients in his That is about or less than what Dr. Weitz treats in

the course of a single year. He treats about, as he testified, 20 patients a week.

Unlike Dr. Weitz, Dr. McKinsey doesn't see the gamut of patients with this condition. He testified that the patients he sees are the most severe, and that is his frame of reference. He doesn't often see patients that were presenting, as it is our contention Mr. El-Hanafi was presenting, patients in the early stage of a development, of developing DVT.

Further, Dr. McKinsey's conclusions that Mr. El-Hanafi's DVT didn't begin earlier are based on a very narrow reading of the BOP records, records that he interprets as indicating isolated pain or swelling that he deemed inconsistent with a DVT.

His conclusions are based on assumptions on how drop-down methods are used to populate fields on medical records and the meaning and comments. His interpretation strains credulity, not to mention the fact that the records he was interpreting are records that the BOP at the very time was creating them, was using to support continued inaction.

Given that the BOP wasn't planning on doing anything and in fact didn't do anything in over a year of complaints, they had an interest in minimizing his symptoms in the reports they created after sick call verdicts where the decision was we do nothing or we continue the course of ibuprofen, compresses, elevate your leg.

Mr. El-Hanafi's own description of his pain and symptoms which Dr. McKinsey testified that he reviewed but could not specifically remember and were not addressed in his timeline of symptomology and otherwise cited in his reports are striking. They are the desperate pleas of a person who is experiencing their symptoms worsen and seeing his complaints ignored, at 17 or 18 months he spent in pain with anxiety as part of his conditions of confinement, part of what makes his conditions of confinement qualitatively different from that of the average inmate of the MCC.

So, finally after 15 months of symptoms and complaints, an ultrasound was ordered, and two months passed until it was performed. Both experts agreed, they do agree this is a long delay. Dr. McKinsey has a machine in his office. Patients in his office rarely wait longer than an hour. A delay of two months is really unthinkable outside of the prison context or possibly perhaps outside of the third world.

Even if Mr. El-Hanafi's DVT started at the time of the ultrasound or the time the ultrasound is ordered, rather, Dr. Weitz told us that even a delay of this long, a delay of two months can lead to disastrous consequences and permanent disability. This is the kind of delay, your Honor, that continues to happen. I have here, which I have already provided to the government, it is just a medical record that

just indicates -- and I can provide it to the court -- it is not all that remarkable. It just indicates that on November 19th, Mr. El-Hanafi got a referral for a nephrologist for the mild renal insufficiency that was testified to at the hearing.

That referral was made, and I apologize, I don't have it, your Honor, but in addition to this, they normally have a special referral sheet that says your condition has been reviewed and you have been, you know, you will be scheduled for a nephrology consult. A sheet like that was also issued in the same day as it was noted in the record. This is dated November 19th, 2014.

As of today's date, two months later, almost exactly two months later, this nephrology consult has not happened. I spoke to the government before this hearing. They informed me it has been scheduled. That is something I have also been hearing from the BOP directly for weeks now as I e-mail them and say do you know what is going on with this?

It has been scheduled. I point this out because a delay of two months is not unusual. Also because at the time that referral was made, it was sheer luck it was made in the first place. Mr. El-Hanafi was taken to see a hematologist, one of many he gets to see by the luck of the draw when he is taken to the hospital. This one happens to be a particularly careful one who went through that day a series of records and look and saw renal labs that were at that point six months' old

and said look at this, these numbers aren't right. Let's have you evaluated further.

I noted the BOP has provided a letter endorsing their own ability to provide excellent care. I do not doubt they have this ability in theory, but what matters here is not what they're theoretically able to do. What matters is what they actually do. What the medical history in this case provides is ample evidence of what they do in practice, they routinely disregard symptoms and delay care or deny it altogether.

Your Honor, this is not my first experience of the inadequacies of BOP medical care. My experience is not limited to pretrial facilities such as MCC or MDC, either. I have had clients who received extremely delayed cancer diagnoses while in their designated facilities and despite complaints, one of whom died there after a delayed diagnosis.

I had another client in a case before your Honor where the client had extremely serious medical conditions, surrendered on a Friday and unfortunately died over the weekend, his first weekend in jail, first weekend at his designated facility which was a medical facility.

Dr. Weitz told the court that it is more likely than not that Mr. El-Hanafi's condition is worse because of the delays in diagnosis in this case. Your Honor pressed him to be specific, and that is as specific as he can get, more likely than not. Mr. El-Hanafi has now a severe post-thrombosis

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

condition, continued pain, decreased mobility and he will have this condition for the rest of his life.

Mr. El-Hanafi is a young man, too young to be this disabled. This course of events, the medical care Mr. El-Hanafi's received, the disability and continuing medical needs he now has and likely he will need, there is a demonstrated prior performance that will inadequately provide for those needs going for forward, is for this Court's consideration under 3553 (a).

As for the abominable living conditions at the MCC for last five years, those conditions are not unique to Mr. El-Hanafi. Those conditions, unfortunately, are endured by a large number of detainees who live there. Your Honor has a letter from Mr. El-Hanafi's bunk mate, who is another person I have spoken to about the conditions specifically on that unit, who happens to be here in court as well to support him, and it is something that I speak to a great many of my clients about prior to sentence, where I ask them what the specific conditions are, how the rodent problem and insect problem is, and these are complaints I normally hear. I do believe it is a little worse in the dorms than it is in the cells where Mr. El-Hanafi is, that the rodent and insect problem is worse there because of the group living that is the nature of a dormitory.

The government has long called Mr. El-Hanafi's medical

issues a red herring and a distraction, and I just want to say again, I am done talking about the medical stuff, but I want to say again that we recognize that the crime to which Mr. El-Hanafi has pled guilty is incredibly serious, and I hope the court knows that, and I also hope the court knows that we have no intention of distracting from it or minimizing it or minimizing Mr. El-Hanafi's culpability. As we have stated many times in our prior submissions, nothing we have presented to

Mr. El-Hanafi accepts absolute responsibility for his actions and he understands he must pay for his criminal conduct with a significant term of imprisonment. Mr. El-Hanafi's medical issues are important, but more important and more striking to me is the change Mr. El-Hanafi's undergone since his arrest in this case.

the court is intended to do that.

I met Mr. El-Hanafi, Ms. Heinegg met Mr. El-Hanafi over three years ago, and at that point he had been in custody for a year and a half. I didn't spend so much time in the beginning as Ms. Heinegg, but I have spent significant time with him recently over the course of preparing for the medical hearing, over the course of preparing for sentencing, and he is a man who is a pleasure to sit down with and speak with. He is a man who always shows concern for me and asks about how I'm doing.

He is a man who expresses on a regular basis to me his

sincere remorse for his actions. He is a man, I watch him come into the visiting room and I watched how he treats the guards who staff the visiting room, and I watch how they treat him. This is something that I experience on a regular basis with a lot of clients, and I can see I have clients who make eye contact. I have clients who ask the guards how they're doing. I have clients — and he is one of those people. He is one of those people.

Then I have clients on the other end of the spectrum who acknowledge nothing and no one, sometimes not even me. He is one of those people who is aware of other people, who cares about how other people are doing, and the people around him notice that. They notice that and they respond to him. When I hand them a paper that says I am seeing El-Hanafi, I can't even — it is not something tangible. It is something, almost like there is a little bit of a relaxed vibe that hits the air because this is a person who is not going to give anyone any trouble and this is a person who is going to be a human being, who is going to treat them like he cares.

Mr. El-Hanafi knows that he'll never be able to change the past, he will never be able to undo what he has done, but he is a person who must live with the horror of what he has done, but that is not going to to go away for him, not going to go away for his family. It is just not going to go away, but he is a person who has a stated commitment, but also how he

actually behaves in the world, who is living a commitment to be different.

Your Honor, I respectfully ask that this Court impose a non-guideline sentence in this case that takes all of this into account. I am not going to request a specific sentence here, although I do note that sentences for defendants convicted of providing material support for terrorism without more tend to fall in the 90 to 180-month range, and that the most severe sentences of 20 years and more have in the vast majority of cases been imposed only on defendants with explicit and concrete plans to commit murder or terrorist acts involving mass fatalities.

Those, too, are defendants without Mr. El-Hanafi's medical issues and include defendants who went to trial, and for those more similarly situated to Mr. El-Hanafi, those whose sentences — they pled guilty and accepted responsibility for their conduct, for their actions as Mr. El-Hanafi has, I have not met those defendants and I can't speak to the sincerity of their remorse or sincere personal transformations they may have undergone or the kind of people they are, but I can tell you this:

In over nine years of practice, I have never met a client as transformed as Mr. El-Hanafi. With every breath he takes, the furthers his commitment to live a moral and law-abiding life, being mindful of and working to improve the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lives of his friends, his family and his fellow citizens.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. El-Hanafi, I have read your letter. There is no requirement for you to speak, but if you would like to speak, I would be glad to hear you now.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to apologize for my I apologize to the court, the government and to my actions. family and to the community. I regret my actions. embarrassed by what I did. I caused too much pain and suffering for people.

Although I cannot change the past, I am dedicated to living every day being the person I should be, a person dedicated to living a moral and law-abiding life, rededicated to my family. That is who I was before I got involved with this terrible ideology and that is a part of the actions I am ashamed of. I have had a lot of time to reflect on my actions and consequences. I didn't just make the wrong choices. made the worst choices. I take full responsibility. I have learned my lesson. I will not go down this path again.

Because of my arrest in this case, I am fortunate to have the opportunity to change the path I was on and to meet and be inspired with very outstanding individuals, the lawyers in my case, Ms. Fink, Heinegg and Kunstler. They helped me understand I am better than the worst actions that I have done and I can choose to live the rest of my life being that better

person. That is what I choose.

I want to thank you, your Honor, for the help you gave me for my medical attention while I was at MCC in the past four years and thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Would the government like to be heard?

MR. CRONAN: Thank your Honor. Might I use the podium as well?

THE COURT: Yes, certainly.

MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, for the past year and a half the focus of this case obviously has been largely on Mr. El-Hanafi's medical condition. I think the first medical report we got was in July of 2013 from a Dr. Laura Chalfin, and since then we obviously had a lengthy hearing last week or the week before.

There have been over a half dozen other medical reports. All of that was appropriate under Section 3553 (a). It was completely proper for the court to consider the medical condition of the defendant and the ability of the BOP to treat him going forward.

But, your Honor, those medical issues have become such a focus in this case over merely two years, and the defendant's arrest now almost five years ago makes it easy to lose sight about what this case is about. It is easy to lose sight about the unspeakable seriousness of the conduct of this man when he

decided to support Al-Qaeda. It is easy to forget the overwhelming demand for deterrence in cases involving terrorism. Those are far and away the most important considerations for this Court when determining the appropriate sentence.

Your Honor, this is a man who was born in Brooklyn, benefited from every opportunity our country has to offer, a great education. He secured an excellent job. He continues to have a very loving family. He was living the American dream. Then he turned his back on America and aligned himself with our country's greatest enemy.

He traveled from Dubai to Yemen, where he pledged an oath of allegiance to Al-Qaeda, and this was no meaningless pledge. For this defendant, his actions spoke louder than his words. Over the course of nearly three years the defendant and this co-conspirators worked tirelessly to support Al-Qaeda. They provided extensive financial support. They supplied tangible items, items that Al-Qaeda required like computer equipment, GPS devices, cold weather gear, remote control devices. They lobbied over and over again to find a path to travel to fight and possibly die in jihad. They wanted to fight with the mujahideen, the mujahideen who were fighting America. It was that conduct which should drive the sentence and it is that conduct that calls for a sentence of 20 years imprisonment.

Your Honor, since the medical issues have been such a focus of this case, I want to spend some time at first talking about the defendant's medical condition and how from the government's perspective they should come into play at sentencing. What should the court consider and what should the court not consider?

The government submits that the court should consider the defendant's current condition, his prognosis going forward and the BOP's ability to provide adequate care during his incarceration. The question looking back of whether the Bureau of Prisons has in the past provided optimal care should not be addressed by this Court for a number of reasons:

First, that issue, the quality of medical care, should not impact what the appropriate sentence is. The question of whether or not Mr. El-Hanafi received appropriate care in the past doesn't go to his history or characteristics. It doesn't go to the seriousness of the offense. It doesn't go for deterrence or need to promote respect for the law. The only way it could come into play is under the guidelines analysis.

There is support that conditions of confinement can be a basis for a downward departure. In this case, under the plea agreement, the parties are not authorized to seek a downward departure or even to suggest that the court consider that.

The second, even if there were a downward departure available, and even granting the most favorable interpretation

of the evidence presented by the defendant, the conditions were not egregious enough to downwardly depart. I am aware of one case where the medical care received by a defendant was considered by the court in granting a downward departure. That case is Mateo, and in Mateo, as I am sure the court is aware from the briefing, a pregnant defendant went into labor while in pretrial detention, didn't receive medical assistance for over 15 hours, and gave birth at the detention center rather than in a medical facility.

In that case, the government stipulated that there was not appropriate medical care, and the court at sentencing determined the trauma from that experience as well as the defendant being a victim of sexual abuse by prison guards warranted a downward departure.

The facts in this case, even most favorably viewing them to the defendant, just simply aren't even in the same universe as what was before the court in Mateo. Again Mateo was a downward departure issue which is not available here. We are not aware of any cases in which a court has reduced a sentence under Section 3553 (a) under any other basis than downward departure.

There is another reason this Court should not reach the issue of standard of BOP care previously. As I am sure the court is aware, the defendant has a pending civil suit in this courthouse against the United States. That suit is pending

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

before Judge Gregory Woods, and that suit is the appropriate venue if there was substandard care for the defendant to seek any redress he is entitled to.

He is pursuing that, and that is the appropriate I am sure in that case the government would argue that forum. a finding at a separate factual hearing in a criminal case in which the BOP was not represented can't be used to estop arguments in a civil case. I think it is very important the court avoid any sort of ruling in this context that can be used against the Bureau of Prisons in a separate civil suit.

THE COURT: I agree with you.

MR. CRONAN: Your Honor, what should the court consider?

First, the defendant's current medical condition and his prognosis; and

Second, the appropriate treatment and the BOP's ability to administer that.

We all agree that the defendant has deep vein thrombosis and that that condition has reoccurred, and depending on various considerations, it may occur again in the future. I think the parties all agree he has a genetic predisposition to developing blood clots that at least makes him somewhat more likely than the general population to have deep vein thrombosis.

There is disagreement as to the seriousness of the

condition and how it will affect his future life. Dr. McKinsey opined basically that on the spectrum of patients he has seen, while the defendant does have deep vein thrombosis, he is on the less serious end of the spectrum and believes if the defendant follows appropriate treatment, most notably anti-coagulation therapy, compression stockings, leg elevation, he can lead a normal life.

Your Honor, I want to take a moment to defend Dr.

McKinsey. Dr. McKinsey is extremely well qualified. He is a
vice chairman of surgery at Mt. Sinai. He is a systems chief
for aortic intervention for the entire Mt. Sinai system. He
has a clinical practitioner treating DVT.

Doctors disagree, but Dr. McKinsey is someone who knew what he was talking about. Dr. Weitz painted a much grimmer picture, and I know your Honor appreciates this, but it was also a picture that largely was based on the defendant's reporting of his own pain or discomfort.

To state the obvious, an individual in that situation had an incentive to exaggerate. I understand the court appreciates that. We don't know about the level of pain and discomfort he is under, but we don't need to know because both doctors are largely in agreement as to appropriate treatment going forward.

The submissions made by the Bureau of Prisons, especially the one made last Friday, made clear the BOP can

administer the treatment that is recommended. First, I know the court knows the defendant has been designated as care Level 4 inmate by the Bureau of Prisons. At that care level, the defendant will be designated to one of six Bureau of Prisons medical referral centers.

The BOP letters talked about the care level at those centers, but in short, they provide inpatient care to seriously ill inmates and a variety of medical services. We are talking more specifically about the care that this defendant needs.

The BOP's letter makes clear that the BOP can administer the specific care that both doctors have recommended.

That is currently happening at the MCC. The Bureau of Prisons has implemented a protocol which we provided to the court for the administration of anti-coagulation medication. The BOP provides compression stockings when medically indicated, and the BOP also regularly revisits that to determine whether or not the stockings continue to be required.

Ultrasounds can be conducted on site or at a local facility. All BOP facilities provide inmates with the opportunity to exercise. The BOP facilities provide materials to help an inmate elevate his or her leg if it is medically indicated. When the BOP transports an inmate, it can assure transportation without immobilization for more than four hours.

There was testimony at the hearing a couple of weeks

ago about the defendant's high blood pressure and possible renal issues. The BOP monitors hypertension and provides appropriate medication to control hypertension. Some BOP institutions, especially medical referral centers, have a nephrologist on site, and if not, there is consultation and treatment provided at local facilities.

All BOP facilities have procedures in place to provide emergency care for inmates. In fact, as I think your Honor is well aware, the BOP medical referral centers are located close to some of the country's finest doctors and hospitals. That is a long way of saying the BOP can handle the treatment that this defendant needs.

What should drive the sentence in this case?

Again, most importantly is the nature of the offense. Your Honor, providing support to Al-Qaeda without question stands at the apex of the most serious offenses anyone, let alone a U.S. citizen can commit against the United States. The defendant chose to support a group that is publicly declared war against the United States and a group that has followed through with that declaration.

His involvement with the group's extreme ideology dated back to 2003 when he was living in Brooklyn. After that initial radicalization, he traveled to the United Arab Emirates, where he made contact with a facilitator, someone who as your Honor is aware, was since been killed fighting in

Syria. Through that facilitator, the defendant made contact with more senior terrorist operatives in Yemen and began providing financial and other support to those people.

He was fully intending that support was going to Al-Qaeda. The defendant was all-in with Al-Qaeda, and he showed that over a course of years. In February 2008 when he traveled all the way to Yemen, he arrived in Yemen, was picked up from a predetermined location, a hood was placed over his head and he was driven to another location where he spent two or three days staying with a senior terrorist operative who went by the name The Doctor.

The defendant made this trip to Yemen so he could be face-to-face with senior members of Al-Qaeda and demonstrate his unwavering support to Al-Qaeda, and he succeeded. I don't say this to make light of Ms. Kunstler's presentation, but I am sure Mr. El-Hanafi was very polite and pleasant when he met with those terrorists out there. So that is part of his appeal, he is a likable person. That is what drew them to him, someone who was from the United States, who would be able to travel to the United States seemlessly without detection and insert himself into the American culture.

In Yemen he pledged that oath of allegiance to Al-Qaeda and The Doctor. He delivered a commuter to The Doctor. El-Hanafi delivered \$12,000 in cash to The Doctor and received assignments from those terrorist contacts that he

conveyed to Hasanoff.

In Dubai he received, the defendant himself received an oath of allegiance from Hasanoff, and he traveled to New York City where he met with another one of his co-conspirators, the person identified as the cooperating witness in the defendant's submission, to encourage that person to also join Al-Oaeda.

Even before that February 1998 trip to Yemen, the defendant was making regular financial contributions to Al-Qaeda. Money, even small sums of money can support terrorism in so many ways. It can buy guns, explosive devices, help terrorist operatives travel. It can help prepare propaganda videos on the internet. As we talked about earlier, in total the defendant and his co-conspirators made \$67,000 in donations to Al-Oaeda. What else?

The defendant and Sibirhan Hasanoff obtained items sought by their terrorist contacts. He researched remote control devices, and Hasanoff later sent the remote control devices to The Doctor. The defendant and Hasanoff knew why their terrorist contacts wanted these remote control devices; so the item can be modified to be detonated at a distance, an explosive that the defendants knew full well Al-Qaeda would want to use against Americans.

The defendant worked to ingratiate himself with his terrorist contacts in hopes of becoming mujahideen, to travel

and receive military-style traveling and fight in armed combat. On top of all of this, the defendant received an assignment from terrorist contacts to arrange for surveillance of locations in the United States, including the New York City Stock Exchange.

El-Hanafi directed Hasanoff to conduct that surveillance during Hasanoff's November 8, 2008 trip to New York and knew full well the only reason the terrorist operatives in Yemen would have wanted that information was for planning a future terrorist operation.

Your Honor, to be perfectly clear, the report Hasanoff prepared was very basic, it was very rudimentary. There was no advance plot against the stock exchange, and the report that Hasanoff actually drafted that the defendant sent along to the contact in Yemen was of no use to them whatsoever.

What matters is El-Hanafi was willing to assign
Hasanoff to conduct that surveillance. He was asked by
terrorists who he understood were with Al-Qaeda to arrange for
surveillance of a densely populated area of Manhattan, and he
did that. He did that to establish bona fides with Al-Qaeda,
and he did that because he was all-in with Al-Qaeda, and he
wanted Al-Qaeda to know.

Your Honor, let me briefly talk about deterrence.

Terrorism is a crime that demands maximum deterrence. As your Honor noted when Hasanoff was sentenced, perhaps the most

important factor in this sentencing is general deterrence. A message must be sent that if you support terrorism, whether you're supporting Al-Qaeda like Gaddafi did, or some other terrorist group or terrorist cause, you will be caught, you will be prosecuted and you will face a long sentence. It is hard to envision many crimes that carry a stronger demand for deterrence. Any level for support for terrorism requires criminal deterrence. A terrorist doesn't need huge sums of money to achieve its causes.

With respect to individual live deterrence and protecting the public from future crimes in particular committed by this particular defendant, it is good to hear Mr. El-Hanafi's comments. The court needs to keep in mind his ability to provide support to Al-Qaeda was not predicated on his youth or physical ability. He wanted to fight with Al-Qaeda, but the support he, in fact, provided was financial in nature. He sent money, he sent items and provided technical training based on his sophistication in computers. He can still do that notwithstanding his medical condition.

The court also asked the parties to brief comparable sentences in terrorism cases. The briefing was pretty extensive, and I know the court has reviewed them and I won't go into detail, except I would disagree with the characterization that 90 to 180 months is a common sentence for this sort of conduct. I think the conduct that might be most

comparable was Iyman Faris, in the Eastern District of Virginia, who received a 20-year sentence. Obviously, the most comparable sentence was the Hasanoff sentence before this Court who received 18 years' imprisonment.

Let me say a few things about that sentence.

Hasanoff's conduct was extremely serious, as reflected by the sentence. The 18 years, as the court may recall that Hasanoff got, reflected what I believe the court indicated was more or less a two-year reduction based on his rehabilitation in prison. I believe there was a letter from the chaplain at the MCC at that sentencing.

I would submit this defendant played a more important role than Sibirhan Hasanoff in this scheme. This defendant, the one who traveled to Yemen, he is the one who had the face-to-face contacts with the Al-Qaeda operatives. He is the one who trained them in encryption. He received the assignments and he is the one who assigned Hasanoff to conduct surveillance at the stock exchange.

Lastly, your Honor, as the court did with respect to Hasanoff, the court should order forfeiture in this case, as agreed by the parties. There was a consent order of forfeiture signed previously, and a forfeiture now should be \$70,000 joint and severally liable as it was for Hasanoff.

Your Honor, there is simply no aspect of this case that calls for any leniency or mercy in sentencing the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant. A sentence of 20 years of imprisonment, as the quidelines recommend, is appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

I need to begin with calculating the advisory sentencing guidelines. I adopt as correct the calculation agreed to by the parties in the plea agreement which results in a total offense level of 37. Although Mr. El-Hanafi has no criminal convictions other than the one for which he is being sentenced today, his criminal history is at the highest level, a Level 6, because he is subject to Section 3A1.4 (b) of the sentencing guidelines which mandates a criminal history of 6 for any crime intended to promote terrorism.

This results in an advisory sentencing quideline level of 360 months to life. However, the maximum terms of imprisonment pursuant to statute in this case are 15 years for Count 1 and 5 years for Count 2, bringing the maximum possible sentence down to 20 years.

I turn now to the sentencing factors mandated by Section 3553, beginning with the seriousness of the offense. As I explained when sentencing Mr. El-Hanafi's co-defendant, Mr. Hasanoff, the criminal conduct in this case was extremely serious and demands a substantial sentence both to impose just punishment and to effect general deterrence. Mr. El-Hanafi swore an oath to Al-Qaeda, a terrorist organization, intent on harming the United States and its citizens and provided

material and technical support to its operatives over the course of several years.

Mr. El-Hanafi provided tens of thousands of dollars to Al-Qaeda. He sought military training and he tried unsuccessfully to be sent to fight jihad. He was unsuccessful in trying to get to a battlefield in part because his senior Al-Qaeda contact wanted to use him and his American co-conspirators instead to destroy targets in the United States, something that Mr. El-Hanafi and his American co-conspirators were willing to do.

Among the material Mr. El-Hanafi provided to his Al-Qaeda contact were video camcorders that could be used by Al-Qaeda to record tactical operations against the U.S. military for use on the internet as propaganda, a remote control car with specific frequencies of radio systems which could be modified and used as components for explosives, a laptop computer, an Atlas translation device and encryption software, a hot spot BPN which creates a secure tunnel between a user and a secured server that encrypts and allows the user to mask the user's IP address.

He also provided technical guidance to his Al-Qaeda contacts and taught them how to use what he brought to them. He recruited another American to work for Al-Qaeda. In total, he and Mr. Hasanoff provided \$67,000 in cash to their Al-Qaeda contact.

Although Mr. El-Hanafi and Mr. Hasanoff were directed to obtain information to assist in blowing up a large American dam and the New York Stock Exchange, Mr. El-Hanafi asked Mr. Hasanoff to obtain information about the New York Stock Exchange, but not the dam. Mr. Hasanoff's ensuing report was, as Mr. Cronan said, so rudimentary as to be useless to his Al-Qaeda contact. It may have been intended to be useless because at that time Mr. Hasanoff and Mr. El-Hanafi had begun to suspect that their Al-Qaeda contact had no intention of sending them to fight jihad.

The report on the New York Stock Exchange said only that the New York Stock Exchange was bordered by four streets. The streets were blocked off from vehicular traffic and someone would have to walk into the building.

Turning to Mr. El-Hanafi's history and characteristics, a number of factors stand out and counsel for a degree of leniency in the sentencing:

First, Mr. El-Hanafi's childhood was marked by abuse and poverty, but he nonetheless became a pillar of strength and supportive love to his relatives, 24 of whom wrote what appear to be heartfelt letters to the court, detailing his generosity toward them. Apart from his very serious offense in this case, his record is unblemished;

Second, the defendant has demonstrated some signs of remorse and rehabilitation during more than four years of

presentencing incarceration. In a letter to the court, Mr. El-Hanafi has expressed regret for what he describes as his blind following of Al-Qaeda's ideology, which he now says he repudiates. He has also expressed appreciation for the privilege of being born and educated in America, a privilege he claims was recently thrown into relief by his relative's struggles for freedom in Egypt. Further, he appears to have been an exemplary inmate. His documented correspondence with prison staff concerning his deteriorating health concerns have been uniformly respectful, and he has committed no disciplinary infractions during this over four-year period in custody;

Third, during his incarceration, he has suffered considerably from a painful deep vein thrombosis and related post-thrombotic syndrome in a leg. That condition which developed sometime after his arrest caused him at times acute pain and substantially limited his mobility and his capacity for recreational activity during a prolonged period during his incarceration.

Although his symptoms are moderately well controlled, his prior pain and suffering was considerable in part because of delays in providing treatment after his diagnosis. As a result, the past four years of confinement have been significantly harsher for the defendant than they would have been for the average inmate. Because he has developed, in addition, Anti-phospholipid Syndrome, he is at high risk for

further damage to his kidneys as well as a fatal pulmonary embolism. His risks will be heightened if he encounters violence in prison.

Absent evidence of the defendant's remorse, rehabilitation and physical suffering during confinement, I would sentence Mr. El-Hanafi to a term somewhat higher than his co-defendant Hasanoff's 18-year term, but in light of the unique factors that counsel for leniency in Mr. El-Hanafi's case, I find that a lower sentence is warranted.

Please stand for sentencing.

In order to effectuate general deterrence and taking into account all the factors I have mentioned, I sentence you on Count 1 to 15 years in prison, and on Count 2 to 5 years in prison, to run concurrently, for a total of 15 years in prison.

You will be on supervised release for three years, which can be shortened if you are permitted to join your family as you have contemplated in Egypt. I impose no fine. I impose forfeiture in the amount of \$70,000, which is payable jointly and severely with your co-defendants. I impose the special assessment of \$200.00, which is mandatory. You may sit while I read the conditions of supervision.

The standard and mandatory conditions of supervision will apply. The following special conditions will apply. You must submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle or any other premises under your control to a search, if the

probation officer has a reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of release may be found. The search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation. You must inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition. You must report to the nearest Probation Office within 72 hours of your release from custody. You will be supervised by your district of residence.

I take it the government moves to dismiss --

MR. CRONAN: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- the pending counts, and I do so now.

Is there anything further before I read the defendant his appeal rights? I note that I will grant the defense request that Mr. El-Hanafi be incarcerated in Fort Devens.

MS. KUNSTLER: Your Honor, I since have discussed that with Mr. El-Hanafi, and we would actual like the court to recommend FMC Butner, which is also a Level 4 medical facility over Devens.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. CRONAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will recommend FMC Butner.

MS. KUNSTLER: Thank your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. El-Hanafi, I read every defendant his appeal rights, and I am reading you yours now.

You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or if there is some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea.

You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you think the sentence is contrary to law. I am sure your lawyers will discuss this with you afterwards if they have not already done so.

With few exceptions, any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of judgment being entered in your case. Judgment is likely to be entered today or within the next few days. If you wish to appeal and you are not able to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you request, the Clerk of the Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

I would like to thank counsel for their unstinting work in the case, very good work, and to wish Mr. El-Hanafi good luck. Thank you.

(Court adjourned)